UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,221	07/27/2005	Christopher Robin Lowe	GJE7140	2605
	7590 04/25/200 K LLOYD & SALIW		EXAMINER	
A PROFESSIO	NAL ASSOCIATION		WOOD, AMANDA P	
PO BOX 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1657	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/520,221	LOWE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	AMANDA P. WOOD	1657				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	L. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 Ja</u>	nuary 2008					
	action is non-final.					
'=		coaution as to the morits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x pane Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 8-13</u> is/are pending in the app	olication.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 8-13</u> is/are rejected.	· · · ——					
<u> </u>						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
 Certified copies of the priority documents 	s have been received.					
Certified copies of the priority documents	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	d in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa					
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	ион друшанон				
	· -					

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's response and amendments filed 30 January 2008 have been received and entered.

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are pending.

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on 30 January 2008 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of Application Serial No. 10/520,323 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 8-13 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowe et al (WO 95/26499) as cited in the IDS filed on 18 February 2005.

A method and device is claimed for detection of a cell, wherein said method comprises immobilising a cell in a device also containing a sensor, and introducing a growth medium, wherein the sensor is sensitive to a product of the cell's growth; detecting any change in an optical characteristic of the sensor; wherein the sensor is a holographic sensor.

Lowe et al beneficially teach a sensor comprising a hologram supported on or within a holographic support medium, wherein examples of such holographic support media can be agar or agarose (i.e., growth medium), see for example, Abstract and page 12, lines 5-20. In addition, Lowe et al teach that a species to be detected is reactive with a substance disposed throughout the sensor, and that a specific binding conjugate of a species to be detected, such as an antibody, may be disposed throughout the sensor (see, for example, Abstract and page 13, lines 1-15). Furthermore, Lowe et al particularly teach that the species to be detected may include cells, bacteria, fungi, and yeasts, among other analytes (see, for example, page 12, lines 20-30). Lowe et al beneficially teach that judicious selection of hologram type, fabrication technique, and analyte species permits a number of different sensors to be produced, to be tailored to detect specific compounds, events and biological species. Lowe et al further teach that sensitivity may be varied by careful choice of specific binding conjugate, type of hologram and fabrication technique used (see, for example, page 11, lines 15-30).

Based upon the beneficial teachings provided within Lowe et al, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was

made to modify the method and device disclosed by Lowe et al to provide a method and device suitable for the detection of a cell, wherein the cell is immobilized in a device also containing a sensor, and introducing a growth medium, wherein the sensor is a holographic sensor, discussed above. Furthermore, Lowe et al beneficially teach that immunotype sensors such as that taught above can be tailored to detect specific compounds, events, or biological species, and that sensitivity can be varied with careful choice of specific binding conjugate, type of hologram and fabrication technique used. The result-effective adjustment of particular conventional working conditions (e.g., a particular means to immobilize the cell or bacteria, and a particular species of bacteria) is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole, was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made, as evidenced by the cited references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

No claims allowed.

Please note that the examiner assigned to the instant application has changed.

Accordingly, any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications

Application/Control Number: 10/520,221 Page 5

Art Unit: 1655

should be directed to examiner Amanda P. Wood whose telephone number is (571) 272-8141. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jon Weber can be reached on (571) 272-0925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

APW Examiner Art Unit 1657 /Christopher R. Tate/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655